

MEMORANDUM

DATE: October 1, 2003

REPLY: EH-43 (Donald Lentzen, 202-586-7428)

SUBJECT: Fiscal Year 2003 Pollution Prevention Performance Tracking and Reporting System Data Call

TO: Site Pollution Prevention/Recycling Coordinators

EXECUTIVE ORDERS 13101 AND 13148 ANNUAL PROGRESS REPORTING

Executive Order 13101, *Greening the Government through Waste Prevention, Recycling, and Federal Acquisition*, and Executive Order 13148, *Greening the Government through Leadership in Environmental Management*, require Federal agencies to submit annual reports on their progress in achieving the goals of the Executive Orders (EO). DOE Order 450.1, *Environmental Protection Program*, requires EH-1, the DOE Agency Environmental Executive (AEE), to prepare annual progress reports based on input from Departmental elements.

This memorandum provides guidance in submitting your site/facility information for the FY03 edition of the EO 13101 and EO 13148 annual progress reports (the annual reports). These annual reports are submitted to the Council on Environmental Quality, the Office of Management and Budget, and the Environmental Protection Agency, and will be posted on the DOE P2 website at: <http://www.eh.doe.gov/p2/>.

As in previous years, data for the annual reports will be collected via the Internet through the DOE P2 website; access is restricted by password protection. All user names and passwords for entering data on the website have changed since 2002. Starting on **October 1, 2003**, user names and passwords can be obtained by email to p2support@eh.doe.gov indicating which sites you will be entering data, and if you need the ability to view (only) other sites data.

Attachment 1 provides a synopsis of instructions and data entry platforms you will find on the DOE P2 website. Detailed instructions on how to enter data are located on the website Help page. To access the Help page, select "Waste Generation/Reduction" from the Reporting Database section of the P2 website homepage. Then select "Enter Data"; enter your user name and password; then click the "How to Entry Data" link. A quality assurance (QA) site data check must be completed before the site P2 Coordinator or site-designee can enter general site information, waste generation data, recycling data and site profile data into the main database. Timelines for electronically reporting site data are shown in Table 1.

P2 AWARD NOMINATIONS

You can also use the DOE P2 website to submit nominations for this year's pollution prevention awards competition. All individuals, teams, or sites with innovative and/or exemplary pollution prevention, recycling, and affirmative procurement projects and practices completed or performed in FY03 are encouraged to submit applications for recognition. The 8 categories of competition will parallel the White House's "Closing-the-Circle" Awards

competition. These categories are:

- Waste/Pollution Prevention
- Recycling
- Affirmative Procurement
- Environmental Preferability
- Education and Outreach
- Environmental Management Systems
- Bio-based Products
- Sustainable Design/Green Buildings

DOE Order 450.1 requires the Program Secretarial Officers (PSOs), the Administrator for the National Nuclear Security Administration, and the Administrators for the Power Administrations to evaluate the P2 nominations from sites under their purview, and post “best-in-class” selections on the P2 website for Departmental recognition. The AEE will use the program offices’ best-in-class selections in preparing the Department’s nominations to the White House Closing-the-Circle Awards competition. A second phase of judging may be held by the AEE in coordination with the program offices to designate DOE’s nominees for the Closing-the-Circle Awards competition, if necessary.

Attachment 2 provides instruction for participating in this year’s P2 awards, and information on how to electronically submit a nomination form is available at <http://www.eh.doe.gov/p2/p2integratedhomepage/p2awprog.asp>. Table 1 list the timelines for site submission of P2 award nominations.

Table 1. P2 Performance Tracking and Reporting System -- Data Entry Timelines

Activity	Date
Website opens for data entry for EO 13101 & EO 13148 annual reports, and P2 award nominations	October 1, 2003
Sites complete entry of EO 13148 report data (Pollution Prevention)	December 5, 2003
Sites submit P2 awards nominations	December 12, 2003
Sites complete entry of EO 13101 report data (Affirmative Procurement)	December 30, 2003

DATA ELEMENTS REQUIRED FOR THE ANNUAL PROGRESS REPORTS ON IMPLEMENTATION OF EOs 13101 & 13148

1. GETTING STARTED: GENERAL INFORMATION ON HOW TO REPORT DATA

Entering Data on the DOE P2 Reporting Website.

All P2 program reporting described in this document will be recorded on the DOE P2 web site. The website is located at <http://www.eh.doe.gov/p2/>. Additional data entry instructions are posted on this website. To enter data on the website, sites and operations/field office personnel must have a password to access the data entry module. All data entries must receive a separate quality assurance check at the site or operations field office level before they are included in the DOE P2 database. Specific details of this process are left to the site to establish. If you need assistance with passwords or the data entry mechanics, please contact Computer Support, EH-33, at 301-903-8358.

To enter data, and for information on how to enter data, select “Waste Generation/Reduction” from the Reporting Database section of the P2 website homepage. Then select “Enter Data”; enter your user name and password which will take you to the “Enter Data Menu.” “**How To Enter Data**” provides instructions for entering data on the web pages, and “**Reporting Guidance**” provides examples and explanations of the types of data collected for the various reports. Please report all radioactive waste types in cubic meters (m³), and hazardous and sanitary solid waste types in metric tons (mt). The web site will convert units other than cubic meters and metric tons to the required units when you enter the data. Conversion tables are also provided on the “**How to Enter Data**” page on the website. When entering data it is important to note that there are two separate categories of waste reporting, (1) routine-generated materials from normal operations and (2) non-routine or legacy waste associated with cleanup/stabilization activities.

2. DESCRIPTION AND GUIDANCE FOR P2 PROGRAM REPORTING

General Program Description and P2 Activities for FY 2003

The following information must be entered before proceeding to the Waste Generation Data page.

- Site name and address
- Name of PSO and contact information
- P2 contact E-mail address and telephone number
- QA concurrence contact information

Section 1 - Waste Generation

The following waste types must be reported as “Routine” or “Non-Routine” wastes, in liquid or solid forms, by each PSO on site and as a site total:

- High-Level

- Transuranic
- Mixed Transuranic
- Low-Level Radioactive
- Low-Level Mixed (Radioactive and Hazardous)

The following waste types must be reported as “Hazardous Waste from Routine Operations” or “Non-Routine” wastes:

- RCRA-Regulated
- State-Regulated
- TSCA-Regulated
- Mixed TSCA

Section 2 - Site-wide Recycling or Reuse Activities and Sanitary Waste Reporting

Report amounts of waste recycled and/or material reused from the following categories in metric tons.

Paper Products:

- Office and mixed Paper
- Corrugated Cardboard
- Phone Books
- Newspapers/Magazines

Scrap Metals:

- Stainless Steel
- Copper
- Iron/Steel
- Aluminum
- Aluminum Cans
- Lead
- Zinc
- Other Scrap Metals (such as mercury)

Precious Metals:

- Silver
- Gold
- Platinum
- Other Precious Metals

Other Items:

- Antifreeze
- Engine Oils
- Toner Cartridges
- Batteries
- Tires
- Food Waste
- Concrete/Asphalt
- Glass
- Fluorescent Bulbs
- Ballasts
- Plastic
- Styrofoam
- Transformers
- Wood (Chips, Compost)
- *Computers/Electronic Equipment
- *Other recycled materials (such as paint, furniture, appliances, pallets, equipment)

*optional reporting

Sanitary waste consists of unwanted materials, such as trash that is generated by normal housekeeping activities and is not considered hazardous, or radioactive, or covered under the Toxic Substances Control Act (TSCA) waste. Sanitary wastes are regulated under the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) Subtitle

D. These wastes must be reported as originating from “Routine Operations” or “Non-Routine Operations” for the site. DOE’s definition of sanitary waste includes discarded construction materials, asphalt, and concrete. For purposes of EO 13101 reporting, these various construction materials are subtracted from the sanitary waste total to provide a measure of RCRA Subtitle D wastes generated by each site and captured in the Waste Minimization database for each site.

Please note that for each waste type reported, you need to provide an explanation for amounts reported for FY 2003 that differ by greater than plus or minus 20 percent from the FY 2002 amounts reported. Also, note that data entries cannot be registered in the DOE P2 database without the site QA data check.

Section 3 - Environmentally Preferable Products Procurement Reporting

Section 6002 of RCRA provides a mechanism to increase government purchasing of recycled-content products. This Affirmative Procurement Program (APP) was designed to help stimulate markets for materials recovered from solid waste by using the government’s purchasing power for such items. EO 13101 requires each agency to report its APP. The annual report, “U.S. Department of Energy Affirmative Procurement and Recycling Fiscal Year 2003 Report” tracks agency purchases of selected items on the EPA Comprehensive Procurement Guidelines (CPG) listed items. Presently EPA lists 54 items in the CPG on its web site at <http://www.epa.gov/cpg/products.htm>. The electronic, web-based reporting format will be generally similar to the previous years’ but will contain new, optional questions relating to your site’s estimate of bio-based product purchasing.

Section 4 - Site P2 Profile

The parameters shown below will be used to construct a site P2 projects and practices profile for 2003. In addition to using information from the profile in the Annual Report, the AEE will share these profiles with the PSOs and the Administrators for the National Nuclear Security Administration and the Power Administrations.

Please complete the profile and briefly describe each significant P2 activity. Multiple entries can be made under items 3 and 4. However, please limit the description of each entry to 50 words or less.

FY2003 SITE P2 PROFILE

1. Have the P2 provisions of the DOE O 450.1 Contractor Requirements Document been incorporated into site management contracts? ☐ Yes ☐ No
2. Have pollution prevention goals, objectives, and targets been incorporated into the site EMS and/or ISMS? ☐ Yes ☐ No
3. Identify and describe projects and practices implemented or in place during the reporting year to reduce generation of waste and releases to the environment from the previous year's amounts:
4. Identify and describe actions taken during the reporting year to incorporate sustainable design and green building practices into site construction operations:
5. List the voluntary EPA programs* for which the site has been officially recognized as a participant:
6. List local, state, regional and national P2 awards received during the reporting period:

* P2-related voluntary programs include, but are not limited to:

- Green Engineering
- Climate Leaders
- Commuter Choice Leadership Initiative
- Energy Star [Buildings]
- National Environmental Performance Track
- National Waste Minimization Partnership
- WasteWise
- Green Power

Section 5 - P2 Program Accomplishment Reporting (Optional)

Over 800 P2 accomplishments were submitted last year. Many entries pertained to relatively small or routine ongoing recycling programs that are best shown as reported quantities in the EO 13101 standard data report form. Other entries proved difficult to interpret because of a lack of adequate program description, use of non-standard definitions, and/or vague cost savings, cost avoidance, and return on investment analysis. Accordingly, the usefulness of this data in the 2002 Annual Reports for EO 13101 and 13148 was limited.

The following optional format and guidance are proposed as a first step in standardizing and improving the usefulness of the accomplishment section of the EO 13148 annual report. Sites are invited to provide constructive feedback and suggestions along with their data entries to advance our search for the best functional and informative report format.

All claims of cost savings, cost avoidance, and return on investment should be documented with verifiable valuations of the costs of goods and services involved. Similarly, calculations should be made using recognized accounting practices. Note that all reported accomplishments should:

- Contribute toward achieving the DOE P2 Goals; and
- Reduce life-cycle cost and the liability of mission-related activities.

Life-Cycle Approach to Estimating Cost Savings or Avoidance

Cost savings and avoidances should be quantified and documented using the optional work sheet below. An example of a completed work sheet is shown to illustrate the desired level of detail. The purpose of the work sheet is to help ensure that all cost factors that may impact the net cost savings or avoidances over the life-cycle of the accomplishment were considered in the analysis. The life-cycle cost factors shown on the work sheet are those areas in which costs typically are incurred over the life-cycle of a P2 project or practice.

Work Sheet Definitions

Baseline – the fundamental plan or approach that existed before implementing a cost-savings or cost-avoidance measure.

Cost Savings – the reduction in Baseline costs resulting from implementing a cheaper approach (e.g, as by using an alternate method that decreases the amount of secondary waste generated).

Cost Avoidance – the reduction in Baseline costs resulting from implementing an approach that avoids costs that otherwise would have been incurred (e.g, as by using an alternate method that avoids the generation of secondary waste).

Life-Cycle – the period over which an accomplishment has positive and/or negative cost impacts.

Instructions for Completing the Optional Work Sheets and Entering Data onto the Website

1. For entering a new accomplishment onto the web site, access the “*Data Collection Menu*” and select the “*Enter Accomplishment Data*” menu option.
2. Briefly summarize the accomplishment (50 words or less). A complete description of the accomplishment is to be entered on the “*Accomplishment Description, Activity, Waste Type, Benefitting/Implementing PSOs*” web page.
3. Once the “*Accomplishment Description*” is entered on the top of the page, use the pull-down lists to identify the “*Pollution Prevention Activity:*” and the “*Waste Type:*”. Use the radio buttons to identify the “*Primary Implementing PSO*” and the “*Primary Benefitting PSO*”. For the “*Secondary Implementing PSO*” and the “*Secondary*

Benefitting PSO”, use the pull-down lists to select the appropriate PSO.

4. A life-cycle cost work sheet is provided to help you document and enter data in the “Implementation Costs, Savings/Avoidance, Waste Reduction Information” section. Consider separately each life-cycle cost factor on the work sheet. If the accomplishment reduced or will reduce the cost of that factor relative to the Baseline, enter the cost(s) in the appropriate column (under either *Baseline* and/or *Accomplishment*).
5. Add the columns separately. Subtract the totals of the two columns as shown in the example work sheet. The result is the net cost savings or cost avoidance of the accomplishment.
6. Report the result on the “*Implementation Costs, Savings/Avoidance, Waste Reduction Information*” web page. Please retain your worksheets for possible future reference.

7. Other Instructions

- An ongoing source reduction and segregation project entered for the first time in FY 2003 should use the average annual waste reduction expected and the projected period over which waste reduction is expected as the basis for calculating and reporting net cost savings/avoidances. These data should be included in the description of the accomplishment.
- The useful life of the accomplishment cannot exceed 10 years. Ten years represents the maximum reasonable time over which waste reduction and net cost savings/avoidance can be expected.
- The completion date for an accomplishment at a site with established closure date cannot extend past the closure date.
- Compile the results from recycling, source reduction, and segregation projects as quantitative entries on the Standard Data Report form.

Should you have any questions about this year’s data call or the input needed, please contact Don Lentzen at 202 586-7428. E-mail address – donald.lentzen@eh.doe.gov.

LIFE-CYCLE COST WORK SHEET				
		Costs		
		Baseline vs. Accomplishment		
		\$000		
		Baseline	Accomplishment	
Life-Cycle Cost Factors		Baseline	Accomplishment	Explanation of Accomplishment Change/ Calculations of Costs
IMPLEMENTATION COSTS (a)		0	0	
	1. Research, Develop. and Demos			
	2. Preconcept. Design/Eng. Studies			
	3. Env., Safety, & Health Activities (b)			
	4. Detailed Design (c)			
	5. Construction (c)			
	6. Startup and Commissioning (d)			
SAVINGS/AVOIDANCE		0	0	
	7. Impacts to Products (e)			
	8. Impacts to Other Operations (f)			
	9. Ops. and Maint. (O&M) Labor			
	10. O&M Materials and Utilities (g)			
	11. Laboratory Analyses			
	12. Risk Impacts (h)			
	13. Other Cost Impacts			
	14. Orphan Waste Treat./Disposal (i)			
	15. Secondary Waste Treat./Dispos. (j)			
	16. Decon. & Decom. and Closure			
WASTE REDUCTION (VOLUME OR MASS)		0	0	
	17. Quantity of Waste Generated(k)			
		\$ -	\$ -	\$0K - NET SAVINGS OF ACCOMPLISHMENT
(a) Record cost differences as positive numbers in 2003 dollars. Do not include sunk Baseline costs (e.g., capital costs incurred before implementing the accomplishment) (b) Include costs to modify environmental permits and the authorization basis, and costs to meet changed compliance requirements. (c) Include actual costs if work is completed, otherwise include estimated costs including project management and contingency. (d) Include costs of readiness reviews/assessments and costs of lost productivity while implementing accomplishment. (e) Include cost of impacts to primary products due to increase/decrease in amounts and other properties with cost implications. (f) Include onsite/offsite costs for added/reduced impacts on supporting operations (e.g., evaporators, utility upgrades, etc.) (g) Include costs of replacement equipment, chemicals, electricity, water, steam, etc. (h) Include costs of failure to effectively implement change (cost of reverting to Baseline approach times the probability of failure). (i) Include onsite/offsite costs for treating and disposing of all nonroutine wastes/failed equipment accumulated during operating life cycle. (j) Include onsite/offsite costs related to increase/decrease in classification, amounts, and other properties for all routine secondary wastes. (k) Identifies reduction in amount waste generated through implementing Accomplishment				

LIFE-CYCLE COST WORK SHEET (EXAMPLE)				
		Costs		
		Baseline vs. Accomplishment		
		\$000		
Life-Cycle Cost Factors		Baseline	Accomplishment	Explanation of Accomplishment Change/ Calculations of Costs
IMPLEMENTATION COSTS (a)		\$ -	\$ 135	
	1. Research, Develop. and Demos	0	90	Lab-scale proof-of-principle planning and tests, (1,000mh)(\$80/mh) + \$10K materials = \$90K
	2. Preconcept. Design/Eng. Studies	0	24	Feasibility investigation, (300mh)(\$80/mh) = \$24K
	3. Env., Safety, & Health Activities (b)	0	0	No change since use of new resin is consistent with current permit and authorization basis
	4. Detailed Design (c)	0	0	No change in design
	5. Construction (c)	0	0	No construction required
	6. Startup and Commissioning (d)	0	21	Startup plan and process verification activities, (300mh)(\$70/mh) = \$21K
SAVINGS/AVOIDANCE		\$ 7,967	\$ 5,975	
	7. Impacts to Products (e)	0	0	No impact on the product stream
	8. Impacts to Other Operations (f)	0	0	Reduced handling/shipping of TRU waste reflected in treatment/disposal cost above
	9. Ops. and Maint. (O&M) Labor	140	105	25% less IX resin change-out; Baseline: (4 change-outs/y)(100mh/changeout)(\$70/mh)(5Y) = \$140k Accomplishment: (.0.75)(4 change-outs/y)(100mh/changeout)(\$70/mh)(5y) = \$105K
	10. O&M Materials and Utilities (g)	50	37	25% less resin Baseline: (10,000gal resin1/y)(\$5/gal) = \$50K Accomplishment: (0.75)(10,000gal resin2/y)(\$5/gal)[5y] = \$37K
	11. Laboratory Analyses		0	No change on required lab analyses
	12. Risk Impacts (h)		0	Zero risk because the change has been successfully implemented for the past year
	13. Other Cost Impacts		0	None identified
	14. Orphan Waste Treat./Disposal (i)		0	No change in orphan wastes
	15. Secondary Waste Treat./Dispos. (j)	7,777	5,833	25% less TRU waste; Baseline: (10,000gal/y)/(drum/45gal)(\$7,000/drum)(5y) = \$7.777K Accomplishment: ((10,000 gal/y)(0.75))/(drum/45gal)(\$7,000/drum)(5y) = \$5.833K
	16. Decon. & Decom. and Closure		0	No change in D&D and facility closure
WASTE REDUCTION (VOLUME OR MASS)		3125 gal/y	2500 gal/y	
	17. Quantity of Waste Generated(k)	3,125	2,500	
		\$ 7,967	\$ 6,110	\$1857K - NET SAVINGS OF ACCOMPLISHMENT
	(a) Record cost differences as positive numbers in 2003 dollars. Do not include sunk Baseline costs (e.g., capital costs incurred before implementing the accomplishment)			
	(b) Include costs to modify environmental permits and the authorization basis, and costs to meet changed compliance requirements.			
	(c) Include actual costs if work is completed, otherwise include estimated costs including project management and contingency.			
	(d) Include costs of readiness reviews/assessments and costs of lost productivity while implementing accomplishment.			
	(e) Include cost of impacts to primary products due to increase/decrease in amounts and other properties with cost implications.			
	(f) Include onsite/offsite costs for added/reduced impacts on supporting operations (e.g., evaporators, utility upgrades, etc.)			
	(g) Include costs of replacement equipment, chemicals, electricity, water, steam, etc.			
	(h) Include costs of failure to effectively implement change (cost of reverting to Baseline approach times the probability of failure).			
	(i) Include onsite/offsite costs for treating and disposing of all nonroutine wastes/failed equipment accumulated during operating life cycle.			
	(j) Include onsite/offsite costs related to increase/decrease in classification, amounts, and other properties for all routine secondary wastes.			
	(k) Identifies reduction in amount waste generated through implementing Accomplishment			

2004 Pollution Prevention Awards Nomination Instructions

(This packet is available electronically on the DOE P2 website at <http://www.eh.doe.gov/P2> beginning October 1, 2003)

AWARDS DESCRIPTION

The Department of Energy (DOE) Pollution Prevention Awards Program recognizes innovative and/or exemplary pollution prevention (P2), recycling, and affirmative procurement projects and practices completed or performed in Fiscal Year 2003. The program also serves as the source for DOE submissions to the White House Closing-the-Circle Awards competition.

Nominations can be made in eight categories:

- Affirmative Procurement
- Environmental Preferability
- Bio-Based Products
- Waste/Pollution Prevention
- Recycling
- Education & Outreach and Information Sharing
- Environmental Management Systems/Lifecycle Assessment/Environmental Cost Accounting
- Sustainable Design/Green Buildings

How to Enter

DOE will continue to use the all-electronic, web-based system. This will streamline the nomination and best-in-class selection process. Each site P2 Coordinator will promote the annual P2 award drive, assist nominees in developing proper nominations and establish internal timelines for submission of nominations to them consistent with the timelines identified in the steps discussed below. Follow these steps to enter a nomination:

1. The nominator selects the most appropriate category for the nomination from the list of categories and award criteria at the end of the instructions, collects the project/practice information, drafts the nomination text, incorporates any attachments, and identifies the PSO/Administrator with responsibility for the project/practice, site, or facility.
2. The nominator logs onto <http://www.eh.doe.gov/P2> and selects “**New Nomination**” to enter the information. The system enables you to save inputted information as a draft and log out of

the system to later return and edit the nomination before final submission. A single file containing supporting images, graphics, or information in Adobe Acrobat PDF format can be attached. The file may contain multiple images (limited to two pages). You must refer to the images in the text portion of your nomination (for example "See figure 1".) The website provides instructions for attaching this file.

3. By clicking "**Submit**" on the website, the nomination will automatically be sent to the site P2 Coordinator for review and screening. From this point forward, the nominator will be able to view the nomination but will not have access for changes.

4. The site P2 Coordinator will screen all nominations for eligibility, verify the nomination authenticity (i.e., is the nominated project/practice description accurate and completed or performed during the prior year, etc.), and secure site management endorsement of the nominations. The site P2 Coordinators must verify the eligibility of all entries received, secure site management endorsement, post all eligible/endorsed nominations on the website, and notify their PSO/Administrator by December 12, 2003.

5. The PSO/Administrators shall select their respective "best in class" P2 awards from the eligible/endorsed nominees and notify the AEE by December 30, 2003. The site P2 Coordinator will designate the "best in class" selection on the website by once received from the PSO/Administrator.

6. The AEE will prepare and submit, using the best-in-class selections, DOE's nominations to the White House Closing the Circle Award competition by January 16, 2004.

Tips for Preparing Your Nomination

1. Submit all requested information.

2. Be clear and concise. The website gives you limited space. Before entering the data into the website, prepare your nominations using a word processing software package. Once completed, you can "cut-and-paste" the information into appropriate fields on the website. Your completed nomination will consist of the following:

a) The completed nomination form, as posted on the website.

b) A one-paragraph abstract of 100 words or less, as described on the website.

c) A description of the nominated activity that, when printed, would total no more than four pages of text (typed in Times New Roman, 12pt Font). Use the appropriate field on the website.

d) A single attachment if desired, in Adobe Acrobat PDF format. This data is limited to two pages and may include any of the following:

- Graphics, charts, or photographs.
- Cost savings, waste reduction, release reduction, or other data.

- Brochure, lesson plan, newsletter, or other printed material developed as part of the activity being nominated.
- Letters of commendation, thanks, and appreciation regarding the program or activity being nominated.
- Newspaper clippings, press releases, or other materials as appropriate.

3. Double-check your nomination before submitting. For example, if you are submitting a nomination on behalf of a team, make sure to include all active participants from your project in the appropriate field. To ensure your entire team is recognized, and to avoid disappointments, you are encouraged to check the spelling of the name of *each person* on your team.

4. Follow all security procedures. Your site, facility, Operations Office, Service Center, or company may follow specific protocols for participating in award programs, for security review or coordinating information being posted on a DOE Website. **Please check with your P2 Coordinator to determine facility-specific requirements and timelines before attempting to submit a nomination.** Still have questions? Here is where to get help: donald.lentzen@eh.doe.gov or call 202 586-7428

ELIGIBILITY

The awards program is open to all pollution prevention projects and practices performed by DOE employees, sites, facilities, programs, and contractors. You may nominate yourself. The activity nominated for an award must:

1. Specifically relate to pollution prevention, affirmative procurement, or recycling as defined in an award category;
2. Have been completed or performed in Fiscal Year 2003, and
3. Meet one of the following criteria:
 - a) Has been funded by the DOE; or
 - b) Has been funded under a contract or subcontract ultimately funded in large part by the DOE; or
 - c) Has been funded under contract with or directly by another U.S. Government agency and have significant positive effects benefiting DOE.

P2 AWARD BEST-IN-CLASS SELECTION CRITERIA

PSO/Administrators are offered the following suggested criteria for their use in selecting “best in class” from site nominations:

1. Does the nomination demonstrate significant benefits to the public?
2. Does the nomination demonstrate significant cost savings to DOE?
3. Does the nominated program or activity demonstrate the use or development of innovative approaches, techniques, or technologies?
4. How well documented are the claims of the nomination with respect to objective data or evidence?

In addition to the general criteria above, each award category includes specific selection criteria described in Table 1.

Table 1: 2004 DOE POLLUTION PREVENTION (P2) AWARDS CRITERIA

CATEGORY	DESCRIPTION	SELECTION CRITERIA*
Affirmative Procurement	This category recognizes the most effective and innovative programs implemented for the purchase and use of products containing recovered materials at a Federal site, facility, or operation. This award focuses on, but is not limited to, those products designated in the Environmental Protection Agency Comprehensive Procurement Guidelines (CPG).	Positive changes made by the individual or facility program as evidenced by descriptions and supporting documentation with quantitative data.
Environmental Preferability	This category recognizes the best examples of acquiring, using, or validating products or services that have reduced adverse impacts on human health and the environment when compared with competing products or services that serve the same purpose; an outstanding improvement to a process that resulted in significant monetary savings and benefit to the environment; product testing that led to the approval and use of environmentally preferable or sound products and services.	Positive changes made by the individual or facility program as evidenced by descriptions and supporting documentation with quantitative data (for example, the amount of waste reduced).
Bio-Based Products	This category recognizes effective and innovative programs implemented for the purchase and use of products containing bio-based materials at a Federal site, facility, or operation.	Positive changes made by the individual or facility program as evidenced by supporting documentation and supporting documentation with quantitative data (for example, the increase in quantity and value of bio-based products purchased by the facility).

CATEGORY	DESCRIPTION	SELECTION CRITERIA*
Waste/Pollution Prevention	This category recognizes reductions in the generation of wastes from a Federal facility through any change in the design, manufacturing, or use of materials or products; and/or the amount of toxicity in waste materials prior to recycling, treatment or disposal	Positive changes made by the individual or facility program as evidenced by descriptions and supporting documentation with quantitative data (for example, the amount of waste reduced through the change).
Recycling	This category recognizes outstanding activities, including outreach, collection, separation, and processing by which products or other materials are recovered from the waste stream for use in the manufacture of new products (other than fuel for producing heat or power by combustion) at a Federal site, facility, or operation.	Positive changes made by the individual or facility program as evidenced by descriptions and supporting documentation with quantitative data (for example, the amount of waste reduced through recycling).
Education & Outreach and Information Sharing	This category recognizes those individuals or teams/groups who have implemented outreach programs/projects or educational efforts designed to promote the goals and objectives of E.O. 13101. These programs successfully acquainted the federal community and the public sector of the environmental and economic benefits of recycling. In doing so, the Program provides tangible benefits to the recycling and "buy recycled" efforts at the facility and or local community. This category also honors the outstanding achievement in P2 or recycling education, training, or technology transfer by the nominated program or facility to other DOE employees, contractors, programs or facilities.	Overall positive local impact and major positive effect on local or community waste generation or recycling rates, public understanding and perception of P2 and recycling activities or of local DOE programs and operations, or on other areas of importance to P2. Judges will consider how well the nominations meet the stated P2 public awareness goals of the DOE facility involved. The nominations for information sharing will be reviewed for overall quality and impact, as well as on how well the material meets the stated P2 goals of the DOE facility involved.

CATEGORY	DESCRIPTION	SELECTION CRITERIA*
Environmental Management System (E.O. 13148)/Life Cycle Assessment/ Environmental Cost Accounting (LCA/EVA)	This category recognizes outstanding achievements resulting from comprehensive, integrated approaches to waste reduction. This includes use of environmental management systems (EMS), particularly in accord with E.O. 13148, as well as management of projects that demonstrate consideration of the full range (cradle to grave) of environmental costs and impacts. Implementation of an EMS includes measurable environmental goals, objectives, and targets that are reviewed and updated as appropriate. A compliance component also is included. Projects employing life cycle assessments and/or environmental cost accounting should include the environmental consideration, in either descriptive or accounting format, of raw material derivations; use and disposal of final products and/or services; material and energy usage and waste; environmental, health, and safety management costs; and use of environmental accounting and life cycle assessment in multiple types of decision-making.	Full integration of the EMS into the entire infrastructure and culture of the site or facility, including management performance, decision-making processes, and community involvement and outreach. Judges should look for nominations that emphasize measured results, not simply effort. Either Judges may also choose an outstanding example of ongoing excellence in an active, implemented LCA/ECA system, or an outstanding individual project planned and implemented using LCA/EVA principles.
Sustainable Design/Green Buildings	This category recognizes innovative Federal government projects employing sustainable design and green building principles. Nominations should be limited to projects that have been completed, are under construction, or have completed the planning process and have been awarded to a successful offeror. Nominations should address all facets of a structure or project's life cycle, e.g., project design, energy efficiency, and building operations. Each nomination should highlight the cost effective use of innovative techniques and solutions that utilize sustainable design principles in the planning, construction, and operation of Federal facilities.	Positive changes made by the individual or facility program as evidenced by descriptions and supporting documentation with quantitative data (for example, level of increase in energy efficiency, reduction in building operation costs, and/or use of environmentally friendly building materials). Nominations should be reviewed for significance, depth, and breadth of impact, importance of waste streams affected, monetary savings, and number of DOE operations positively affected.

* PSOs/Administrators may select one or more nominations as the “best” in each category or they may decide that no award is warranted in a particular category.

Attachment 3

Pollution Prevention/Recycling Coordinators

NNSA Service Center, Albq
Mike Sweitzer
Christina Houston/Charlie Henn
msweitzer@doeal.gov
chouston@doeal.gov/chenn@doeal.gov

Kansas City Site Office
Phil Keary/Bill Schlosberg
pkeary@kcp.com/wschlosberg@kcp.com

Los Alamos National Laboratory
Joe Vozella/Tom Starke/Dennis Hjerensen
jvozella@doeal.gov
tps@lanl.gov
d_hjerensen@acs.org

Pantex Plant
Craig Snider
csnider@pantex.doe.gov

Sandia National Laboratories/CA
Carolyn Holloway/Laurie Farren
cholloway@doeal.gov
ljfarre@sandia.gov

Sandia National Laboratories/NM
Carolyn Holloway/Jack Mizner
cholloway@doeal.gov/jhmizne@sandia.gov

Waste Isolation Pilot Plant
C.L. Woodin/David Emery
cindy.woodin@wipp.ws
david.emery@wipp.ws

Chicago Operations Office
Antanas Bindokas
antanas.bindokas@ch.doe.gov

Ames Laboratory
Dan Kayser
kayser@ameslab.gov

Argonne National Laboratory - East
John Loomis/Keith Trychta
john.loomis@ch.doe.gov/ktrychta@anl.gov

Argonne National Laboratory - West
William Bass/Adrian Collins
greg.bass@anlw.anl.gov
adrian.collins@anlw.anl.gov

Brookhaven National Laboratory
Terri Kneitel/Glen Todzia
George Good
kneitel@bnl.gov/todzia@bnl.gov
goode@bnl.gov

Environmental Measurements Laboratory
Al Crescenzi
alcres@eml.doe.gov

Fermi National Accelerator Laboratory
Sally Arnold/Eric Mieland
sally.arnold@ch.doe.gov/Mieland@fnal.gov

New Brunswick Laboratory
Eric Dallmann
eric.dallmann@ch.doe.gov

Princeton Plasma Physics Laboratory
Jeffrey Makiel
Scott Larson/Tom McGeachen
jmakiel@pppl.gov
slarson@pppl.gov/tmcgeach@pppl.gov

Albany Research Center
Steve Curfman/Greg Slavens
curfman@alrc.doe.gov/slavens@alrc.doe.gov

Bonneville Power Administration
James Meyer/Steve Sander
jrmeyer@bpa.gov
srsander@bpa.gov

National Energy Technology Laboratory (NETL)
- Morgantown
Bruce Webster
webster@netl.doe.gov

National Energy Technology Laboratory (NETL)
- Pittsburgh
Bruce Webster
webster@netl.doe.gov

National Petroleum Technology Office
David Alleman
dalleman@npto.doe.gov

National Renewable Energy Laboratory
Matt Graham/Robert Westby
Steve Blazek
matt.graham@go.doe.gov/robert_westby@nrel.gov
steve.blazek@go.doe.gov

Naval Petroleum & Oil Shale Reserves (CO,UT,WY)
Don Ross
don.ross@rmotc.doe.gov

Southeastern Power Administration
Herbert Nadler
herbn@sepa.fed.us

Southwestern Power Administration
Darlene Low
darlene.low@swpa.gov

Strategic Petroleum Reserve Project
Management Office (SPRPMO)
Katherine Batiste/Terry Heaton
katherine.batiste@spr.doe.gov
teresa.heaton@spr.doe.gov

Western Area Power Administration
Gene Iley/David Pearson
iley@wapa.gov/pearson@wapa.gov

Office of Depository Development (Yucca)
Scott Wade/Lee Bishop
scott_wade@ymp.gov/Lee_Bishop@ymp.gov

Idaho Operations Office
Robert Stump/Robert Starck
stumprc@id.doe.gov
starckra@id.doe.gov

Grand Junction Projects Office
Don Metzler/Cheri Bahrke
donald.metzler@gjo.doe.gov
cheri.bahrke@gjo.doe.gov

Idaho National Engineering & Environmental
Laboratory
Robert Stump/Anne Dustin
stumprc@id.doe.gov/dustal@inel.gov

Nevada Site Office
Carol Shelton
shelton@nv.doe.gov

Nevada Test Site/North Las Vegas Facility
Vicky Davis/Alfred Karns
davis@nv.doe.gov/karnsaj@nv.doe.gov

Livermore Site Office
Karin King
karin.king@oak.doe.gov

Energy Technology Engineering Center
Karin King/Ravnesch Amar
karin.king@oak.doe.gov/ravnesch.amar@boeing.com

Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory
Karin King/Nancy Rothermich
karin.king@oak.doe.gov
nerothermich@lbl.gov

Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory
Karin King
Thomas Kato
karin.king@oak.doe.gov
kato3@llnl.gov

Stanford Linear Accelerator Center
Karin King/Richard Cellamare
karin.king@oak.doe.gov
rcellamare@slac.stanford.edu

Ohio Field Office
Doug Maynor/Richard Govers
doug.maynor@ohio.doe.gov
rgovers@chamberlaingroup.net

Ashtabula Environmental Management Project
Thomas E. Williams/Joe Britcher
tom.e.williams@ohio.doe.gov
joe_britcher@rmies.com

Columbus Environmental Management Project
Thomas Baillieu/Steve Schmucker
thomas.a.baillieu@ohio.doe.gov
schmucks@battelle.org

Fernald Environmental Management Project
Pete Yerace/John Sattler
Donna Lake
pete.yerace@fernald.gov
john.sattler@fernald.gov
donna.lake@fernald.gov

Miamisburg Environmental Management Project
Rob Rothman
Carol Anderson
Patricia Brechlin
robert.rothman@ohio.doe.gov
andecr@doe-md.gov
patricia.brechlin@ohio.doe.gov

West Valley Demonstration Project
Cathy Bohan/Jerald Hoch/Donald Klenk
Herman R. Moore
catherine.m.bohan@wv.doe.gov
hochj@wvnsco.com/klenkd@wvnsco.com
herman.r.moore@wv.doe.gov

Oak Ridge Operations Office
Richard Martin
Richard Meehan/Vince Adams
Harvey Rice
martinrw@oro.doe.gov
meehanrw@oro.doe.gov
adamsv@oro.doe.gov
riceh@oro.doe.gov

East Tennessee Technology Park
Richard Martin
Paula Kirk/Lori Manis
martinrw@oro.doe.gov
kgp@ornl.gov/lmanis@dpri.com

Oak Ridge Institute for Science and Education
Walter L. Warnick
T. Wantland
warnickw@osti.gov
wantlant@ornl.gov

Oak Ridge National Laboratory
Richard Martin/Susan R.C. Michaud
Mac Roddy
martinrw@oro.doe.gov
sun@ornl.gov/roddyelc@ornl.gov

Oak Ridge Y-12 National Security Complex
Richard Martin/Jan Gilbert
martinrw@oro.doe.gov
gtl@y12.doe.gov

Office of Scientific and Technical Information
Richard Martin/Bryan Williams
B. Webster
martinrw@oro.doe.gov
williamsb@osti.gov
websterb@osti.gov

Paducah Gaseous Diffusion Plant
Richard Martin
W. David Tidwell/Brian A. Bowers
martinrw@oro.doe.gov
tidwellwd@ornl.gov
babowers@lan-ky.com

Portsmouth Gaseous Diffusion Plant
Richard Martin
Dewintus Perkins/Mitch Newman
martinrw@oro.doe.gov
qpk@ornl.gov/mitch.newman@wastren.com

Thomas Jefferson National Accelerator Facility
Barbara Morgan/Linda Evan
martinrw@oro.doe.gov
bmorgan@jlab.org
lle@jlab.org

Weldon Spring Site Remedial Action Project
Richard Martin/Tom Pauling
Terri Uhlmeier
martinrw@oro.doe.gov
tpauling@wssrap.com
tuhlmeier@wssrap.com

Rocky Flats Field Office
Dave Maxwell
dave.maxwell@rf.doe.gov

Rocky Flats Environmental Technology Site
Dave Maxwell
dave.maxwell@rf.doe.gov

Richland Operations Office
Oscar Holgado
oscar_m_holgado@rl.gov

Office of River Protection
Oscar Holgado/Thomas Gardner-Clayson
oscar_m_holgado@rl.gov
gardtw@rl.gov

Hanford Site
Lori Huffman/Joe Coenenberg
lori_a_huffman@rl.gov
joe_g_coenenberg@rl.gov

Pacific Northwest National Laboratory
Oscar Holgado/Kim Fowler
oscar_m_holgado@rl.gov
kim.fowler@pnl.gov

Savannah River Operations Office
Stephen Mackmull
stephen.mackmull@srs.gov

Savannah River Site
Tom Coffield
John Harley/Sarita Berry
tim.coffield@srs.gov
john.harley@srs.gov
sarita.berry@srs.gov